

Appl. No. 10/781370
Reply to Action dated 2/3/2006
Page 4

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 remain pending. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 4 indicating that "cylinder portion" should be preceded by "a". Claims 2 and 4 have been amended so that the objection is no longer applicable.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamaguchi. (US 4,852,678).

Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 1 now requires that each of the front and rear side joining portions has a boss projecting inwardly from the first end portion so that the front and rear side joining portions do not project outwardly. Basis for the amendment is found on page 7, lines 22-24.

Yamaguchi discloses the opposite. Yamaguchi discloses bosses as integral with the engine (see column 7, lines 54-55 and column 9, lines 47-48). Since Yamaguchi does not disclose all the elements of the motorcycle of claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated. Also, claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are not anticipated.

Claim 1 is further distinguished from the prior art. That is, the prior art does not disclose or point to "said lower joining portions having a front side joining portion formed in an upper portion of the front end of said cylinder block and a rear side joining portion formed in an upper portion of a rear end of said cylinder block".

With respect to claim 2, the prior art does not disclose structure such that each of lower joining portions of the front frame comprise a member with bosses projecting inwardly from the member to overlap the cylinder block of the engine.

In addition, with respect to claim 4, the prior art does not disclose the front frame having a member with the first end portion on a first side where the cylinder block is joined to the front frame and a second end portion on a second end where the front frame

Appl. No. 10/781370
Reply to Action dated 2/3/2006
Page 5

is connected with the the head pipe such that the first end portion of the member is wider than the second end portion. In this regard, see "W1" and "W2" in Fig. 2.

In view of the distinguishing structure and lack of disclosure in the prior art with respect to claims 1, 2 and 4, it is submitted that the claims are patentable.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious on consideration of Yamaguchi in view of Adachi.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Claim 5 further requires that the front frame has a middle portion which is convex upward and rearward so that in side view the front frame overlaps the cylinder head. The references do not disclose the distinction. The distinction is important because it allows for the cylinder head and the radiator to be located such that the front frame overlaps them. The Examiner indicated that Yamaguchi discloses a middle portion with a shape that is convex in the upward and rearward direction and pointed to in Fig. 3. That is incorrect. Figs. 2 -6 of Yamaguchi disclose a first embodiment. Figs. 2 and 5 clearly show that the front frame in side view does not have a middle portion with a shape that is convex in the upward and rearward direction. The front frame of Yamaguchi does not overlap the cylinder head. Adachi is even less applicable. It is submitted that claim 5 is non-obvious and patentable.


In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are requested. Allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 at an early date is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: April 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 
James A. Larson
Reg. No. 40,443
CBH/lad